

REMARKS

Claim 8 has been added. Therefore, claims 1-8 are currently pending in the application. On page 2 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner alleged that Thatte suggests a message and action relationship storing part for storing contents of an action that is a reaction to a message and adapted to search for corresponding action with a message body as a search key. In particular, the Examiner alleged that client context may provide an initial look-up of appropriate per context wrapper and policy set tables.

Thatte describes a policy set including client-side and server-side policy objects to which client-side and server-side call events are respectively delivered when a call is made from the client context to the server context. According to Thatte, the policy set table provides a mapping of a pair of contexts in an illustrated environment to a policy set that provides context switching between contexts. The policy set table is indexed by a client and server context pair ("CCTXT" and "SCTXT") to "look up" their respective policy set. See Thatte, column 16, lines 39-44. See a/so Thatte, FIG. 1.

In light of the foregoing, Thatte does not teach or suggest, "a message and action relationship storing part . . . adapted to search for a corresponding action with a message body as a search key," as identified by language of independent claim 1, for example.

In Thatte, a search is not performed for a corresponding action with a message body as a search key. Thatte clearly states that the policy set table is indexed by a client and server context pair. The index is used to search for a corresponding policy for the index pair. Thus, in Thatte, the search is performed in an attempt to locate a particular policy corresponding to a client/server context pair. The policy is not an action with a message body as a search key. Moreover, as Thatte clearly states that the client/server pair serves as an index, Thatte does not disclose use of a message body as a search key. Rather, Thatte simply uses an index to search.

The Examiner further alleged on page 2 of the Advisory Action that the "QueryInterface()" function can be called with an interface identifier as an argument and returns a pointer to the interface associated with the interface identifier.

Thatte discloses that the COM⁺ library provides an API function that the client program can call to request creation of a component using its assigned CLSID and an IID of a desired interface. The COM⁺ library defines standard interfaces supported by COM objects, including the "Iunknown" interface. The "Iunknown" interface includes a member function named "Query

Interface," which can be called with an interface identifier as an argument and returns a pointer to the interface associated with the interface identifier.

In contrast to the present invention, Thatte's "QueryInterface()" function simply uses the interface identifier to search for a pointer, not a corresponding action. Moreover, the pointer does not have a message body as a search key.

In light of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 4, 6, and 7 are patentable over Thatte, as Thatte fails to disclose, "a message and action relationship storing part . . . adapted to search for a corresponding action with a message body as a search key," as identified by language of independent claim 1, for example.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 8 is patentable over the reference, as Thatte does not teach, "selecting a received message, said received message being representative of a message whose type is matched; and searching for an action corresponding to said received message; wherein said selecting and searching reduces a load of an object and enhances speed of message and action relationship processing."

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1/25/00

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501